

## REMARKS

The status of the claims in the application is as follows:

Claims / Section	35 U.S.C. Sec.	References / Notes
7, 8, 28 and 30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowed</li> </ul>
1, 2, 5, 6, 9-11, 15-17, 20-24, 28, 29 & 31-35	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hagström, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,434); and</li> <li>Admitted Prior Art (APA).</li> </ul>

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 7, 8, 28  
5 and 30. Applicant has canceled claims 20, 21, 22 and 24, and has added claim 36  
with this amendment, and has provided discussion for distinguishing the remaining  
pending claims from the art cited against it.

Applicant's use of reference characters below is for illustrative purposes only and is not intended to be limiting in nature unless explicitly indicated.

10           **35 U.S.C. §103 (a), CLAIMS 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-11, 15-17, 20-24, 28, 29 & 31-35**  
                   **OBVIOUSNESS OVER HAGSTRÖM AND APA**

In the OA, on pp. 2-4, the Examiner stated that claim 1 of the present invention is obvious over Hagstrom and the Admitted Prior Art (APA).

The Examiner indicated that Hagstrom discloses each feature of independent

15 claim 1, noting that:

20 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement any number of parallel transmission systems with any combination of known band-pair signaling modes (GSM, FDD/TDD, DECT, pure FDD, or pure TDD), including the

associated switching and multi-port filtering circuitry for the advantage of providing maximum compatibility with the system in which the phone is to be used.

The Examiner then further applied the APA and stated:

5           Applicant's admitted prior art discloses that multiple  
switches may be used in known multi-band system in lieu  
of a diplexer (multi port filtering circuit) for the advantage  
that the system may implement standards whose  
10           frequencies are closer to (adjacent) to each other  
(applicant's specification page 2 lines 10-25). Hagstrom  
further discloses a deficiency in his system that the  
multiport filter only supports different signaling modes  
with sufficient separation. It would have been obvious to  
15           one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this  
application to implement a multiple switch in lieu of the  
multiport filter for the advantage of being able to support  
signaling modes whose frequency ranges are closer  
together.

20           Examiner further notes that 'multi-band' and 'multi-mode'  
interfaces are the same for the reason that, as far as the  
front end (such as Fig. 5 of Hagstrom) is concerned, the  
only difference in the transmission systems is the  
operating frequency range (all the signals are either  
25           switched or frequency filtered before being digitized). As  
such, the interface would treat a set of signaling  
standards in the same manner regardless of whether  
they belonged to a 'multi-band' or 'multi-mode' system  
(bands' and 'modes' are just signaling standards defined  
by a frequency range).

30           With regard to the APA, it is admitted in paragraph [0005] that a multiple  
switch can be used to separate signals of different mobile systems from one  
another. However, there is indication that multiple switches could be used for  
separating TX/RX signals attributed to the same, mobile system. On the contrary, in  
the present invention as claimed in claims 1 and 31 respectively, a multiple switch is  
35           used to switch between different mobile systems as well as to separate a receive  
and a transmit band of same mobile system operating in a pure TDD mode.

In Fig. 5 of Hagström, a triplexer 51 is provided in order to replace undesirable switches shown in Fig. 4. The triplexer 51 comprises a diplexer for separating the DECT path and the GSM path, and a duplexer for separating the TX/RX of the GSM path, wherein both the diplexer and duplexer comprise passive electrical components. Eliminating semiconductor switching components is advantageous in view of minimizing the energy consumption and the production costs. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not replace the triplexer 51 by a semiconductor component such as a multiple switch. Such a person would not replace a combination of a triplexer 51 and a switch 14 shown in Fig. 5 of Hagström by a single switch since the sufficient isolation of TX/RX sub-paths of a first path from the second path could be problematic in this case. Therefore, using a multiple switch for this purpose is inventive in view of Hagström and the APA of the specification of the present patent application, as indicated by the Examiner.


For this above reasons, Applicant asserts that the claim language and arguments presented above clearly distinguishes over the prior art, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection from the present application.

### CONCLUSION

Inasmuch as each of the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and arguments presented, and all of the examiner's suggestions and requirements have been satisfied, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered, the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be passed to issue.

Appl. No. 10/029,323  
Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,877)  
Mark Bergner  
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473  
(312) 258-5779  
Attorney for Applicants

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 23, 2006.

